

U.S. Serial No. 10/791,912

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated January 10, 2006, wherein claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Derocher et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,476,795 ("Derocher"). In addition, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 12 and 14-15 were rejected as being "obvious" over the combination of "Admitted Prior Art" in view of Blackwell, U.S. Patent No. 6,905,370 ("Blackwell") and further in view of Dalton et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,644,873 ("Dalton"). Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the hot contact adapter is "for charging a portable computer".

Claim 10 has been amended to correct its form such that it depends from claim 2 instead of claim 1, thereby providing proper antecedent basis for "said alignment structure".

Claim 14 has been amended to correct a typographical error.

Traversal of Rejections

Claims 1, 5 and 6 were rejected as being anticipated by Derocher. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Derocher teaches a portable computer system including a mouse bay and a connector for coupling to the mouse, wherein a battery in the mouse is recharged when the mouse is in the mouse bay. As set forth previously, claim 1 of the Fujitsu application has been amended to recite that the hot contact adapter is "for charging a portable computer" rather than "for a portable computing device". Since Derocher is directed to recharging a mouse when it is coupled to a mouse bay instead of being directed to a hot contact adapter for charging a portable computer, it cannot be said to anticipate independent claim 1 of the Fujitsu application.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Derocher fails to anticipate claims 1, 5 and 6.

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 12 and 14-15 were rejected as being "obvious" over the combination of the Admitted Prior Art in view of Blackwell and further in view of Dalton. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

U.S. Serial No. 10/791,912

The Admitted Prior Art in the background of the invention sets forth that portable computing devices that use rechargeable batteries require periodic connection to a source of power to replenish their energy stores. These devices include a power input port or jack which accepts a connector attached to a power source, such as the DC output of an external voltage converter connected to a an AC power outlet, or an automotive electrical system. The power input port is typically configured so that is can be used both as a source of power for operating the device and for recharging the device battery. Some portable computing devices are adapted to reside in a cradle or docking station which provides various types of connections to the device. Typically, the cradle or docking station has a specialized or proprietary plug-in type connector which supplies operating power to the device as well as providing the additional functionality, as described.

As set forth in the Office Action, the Admitted Prior Art "lacks the use of a hot contact adapter comprising a plug which is insertable into a power port of the computing device and a body connected to said plug, said distal surface comprising a pair of generally flat electrodes electrically coupled to the power input port and adapted for mating with a pair of corresponding electrodes positioned in a charging cradle". The Office Action attempts to use Blackwell and Dalton to cure the numerous deficiencies of the Admitted Prior Art.

Blackwell provides an adapter for use with existing network tap modules to be received by a housing that supports hot-pluggable modules. The adapter allows an existing network tap module to connect to a power supply connector and power supply included with a housing for network tap modules. The housing allows the user to maintain all network taps in any given system in one housing and location, thus increasing the ease of maintaining multiple network taps and allowing the network tap modules to be powered by a power supply included with the housing. The adapter allows use of the housing with existing network tap modules, eliminating any need to replace existing modules in order to use the housing.

Dalton teaches an electrical device with a receptacle for receiving a radio. In particular, a lever carrying one or more contacts is pivotally positioned on one wall of the receptacle so that when the radio is inserted in the receptacle, the lever is pivoted and its contacts brought into engagement with contacts on the radio.

In order to rely upon a reference under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the reference must be analogous prior art. In this regard, each of Blackwell and Dalton are directed to disparate fields of

U.S. Serial No. 10/791,912

endeavor than that of the Fujitsu application, and are therefore nonanalogous art that may not properly be relied upon in rejecting the claims of the invention. Referring to MPEP 2141.01(a), the examiner must determine what is "analogous prior art" for the purpose of analyzing the obviousness of the subject matter at issue. "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). With respect to analogy in the electrical arts, see, for example, *Wang Laboratories, Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858, 26 USPQ2d 1767 (Fed. Cir. 1993), in which the patent claims were directed to single in-line memory modules (SIMMs) for installation on a printed circuit motherboard for use in personal computers. The court held that reference to a SIMM for an industrial controller was not necessarily in the same field of endeavor as the claimed subject matter merely because it related to memories. The reference was found to be in a different field of endeavor because it involved memory circuits in which modules of varying sizes may be added or replaced, whereas the claimed invention involved compact modular memories. Furthermore, since memory modules of the claims at issue were intended for personal computers and used dynamic random-access-memories, whereas reference SIMM was developed for use in large industrial machine controllers and only taught the use of static random-access-memories or read-only-memories, the finding that the reference was nonanalogous was supported by substantial evidence.

In the instant case, the present invention is directed to a hot contact adapted for charging a portable computer. By contrast, Blackwell is directed to an adapter for use with existing network tap modules to be received by a housing that supports hot-pluggable modules. This reference is neither in the field of applicant's endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. In particular, one of ordinary skill seeking to provide a hot contact for charging a portable computer would not be reasonably expected or motivated to look to an adapter for use with existing network tap modules. Dalton is directed to an electrical device with a receptacle for receiving a radio. Similar to Blackwell, Dalton is neither in the field of applicant's endeavor, nor reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. In particular, one of ordinary skill seeking to provide a hot contact for charging a portable computer would not be reasonably expected or motivated to

U.S. Serial No. 10/791,912

look to an electrical device with a receptacle for receiving a radio. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that each of Blackwell and Dalton are directed to disparate fields of endeavor than that of the Fujitsu application, and are therefore nonanalogous art that may not properly be relied upon in rejecting the claims of the invention.

Blackwell and Dalton may not be properly relied upon in rejecting the claims of the invention for the reasons set forth above. Additionally, there would be no motivation to combine these dissimilar references with the Admitted Prior Art outside of impermissible hindsight reasoning. Moreover, even assuming that the references could be properly combined, merging these unrelated inventions would clearly destroy the functionality of the resultant device.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Admitted Prior Art in view of Blackwell and further in view of Dalton fails to render obvious claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 12 and 14-15.

#### Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-8, 10, 12 and 14-15 is solicited. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this and concurrent replies to charge payment (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 19-1853 for any additional required fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 24, 2006

  
David E. Heisey  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,651  
c/o SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP  
12544 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300  
San Diego, California 92130-3051  
Telephone No.: (858) 720-8936  
Facsimile No.: (858) 509-3691